STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

RALPH E. SOCHOCKI and LINDA L. SOCHOCKI,

UNPUBLISHED August 14, 2001

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

V

No. 220043 Oakland Circuit Court LC No. 93-459004-CK

TRANSAMERICA TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, L.H.R. EVANS & ASSOCIATES, INC., RUDY D. LOZANO, DENNIS LALONE, and THOMAS E. CHAPDELAINE,

Defendants-Appellees.

Before: Doctoroff, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr. and Hoekstra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Plaintiffs appeal as of right the trial court's order granting summary disposition under MCR 2.116(C)(10) in favor of all defendants on plaintiffs' claims for damages arising out of an easement across plaintiffs' property to an adjacent, rear parcel owned by defendant Thomas Chapdelaine. We affirm.

Plaintiffs present numerous arguments in support of their claim that summary disposition should not have been granted to defendants because material issues of fact existed for resolution by the trier of fact. However, plaintiffs failed to present any authority in support of their arguments and, therefore, have abandoned this issue on appeal. MCR 7.212(C)(7); Wilson v Taylor, 457 Mich 232, 243; 577 NW2d 100 (1998); People v Davis, 241 Mich App 697, 700; 617 NW2d 381 (2000). A party may not leave it to this Court to search for authority to sustain its position. Staff v Johnson, 242 Mich App 521, 529; 619 NW2d 57 (2000).

Even if we were to consider plaintiffs' claim, we would conclude that the trial court properly granted judgment for defendants because plaintiffs failed to present any documentary or other evidence below in opposition to defendants' well-supported motion for summary

¹ Instant plaintiffs also appealed the trial court's granting of the easement in a related case, *Chapdelaine v Sochocki* (Docket No. 219381, LC No. 92-431336-CH).

disposition under MCR 2.116(C)(10). See MCR 2.116(G)(4); *Maiden v Rozwood*, 461 Mich 109, 120-121; 597 NW2d 817 (1999).

Affirmed. Defendants may tax costs under MCR 7.219(A).

/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff

/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra